

Remarks

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7 and 15-18 are allowed. Claims 8-14 stand rejected.

Claims 8-9 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddersen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,475,206) (hereinafter referred to as “Reddersen”) in view of Fishbine et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,467,403) (hereinafter referred to as “Fishbine”).

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Metlitsky et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,545,886) (hereinafter referred to as “Metlitsky”).

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Grodevant et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,260,554) (hereinafter referred to as “Grodevant”).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Shreesha et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,798,516) (hereinafter referred to as “Shreesha”) and Park (U.S. Pat. No. 5,675,424) (hereinafter referred to as “Park”).

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine, Shreesha, and Park as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Grodevant.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 8 as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as the Office Action (Paper No. 14) recites language that simply is non-existent in the pending and rejected independent

claim 8 in its present state after the request to enter the unentered amendment previously filed on August 18, 1999 in an effort to support a rejection of the independent claim 8. The request to enter the unentered amendment previously filed on August 18, 1999 was made in a continuation prosecution application filed on September 20, 1999. The Applicants believe that the Examiner has mistakenly mis-characterized the subject matter as claimed by the Applicants within independent claim 8.

Independent claim 8 is directed towards a coded image capture and decoding system having a remote capture unit and a host unit. The remote capture unit includes, among other things, an image processing circuit that generates a plurality of coded images and an image buffer, coupled to the image processing circuit, that stores the plurality of coded images generated by the image processing circuit. The host unit includes, among other things, a processing circuit that performs decode processing of coded images and an interface circuitry that assists in delivering the plurality of coded images to the processing circuit from the remote capture unit for decoding after the plurality of coded images have been stored in the image buffer.

In contradistinction, the Office Action (paper no. 14) recites language that is simply non-existent in the independent claim 8 to support a 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 8. The Office Action (paper no. 14) recites language of “an optical system operably coupled to the image processing circuit, wherein the optical system reads a target to produce image data and transfers the image data to the image processing circuit” and “wherein at least one of the coded images comprises a plurality of values, each represents

a transition point in the image” and “a wireless link from the scanner to the remote terminal[.]” (see Office Action, paper no. 14, p. 3).

The Applicants request clarification of the grounds to support any rejection of the independent claim 8.

As the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ground of rejection of the independent claim 8 is currently stated in the Office Action (paper no. 14), the Applicants simply claim subject matter that is not arrived at in the combination of Reddersen and Fishbine, and therefore the Applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 8. Moreover, claims 9 and 14, being a further limitation upon an independent, allowable base claim 8, is also allowable. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections as well.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 13 as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Metlitsky.

The combination of Metlitsky with Reddersen in view of Fishbine does not overcome the deficiencies of Reddersen in view of Fishbine given the apparent mischaracterization of the subject matter as claimed by the Applicants within independent claim 8 as shown in the Office Action (paper no. 14). Therefore, the Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections. Moreover, claim 13, being a further limitation upon an independent, allowable base claim 8, is also allowable. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection as well.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 12 as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Grodevant.

The combination of Grodevant with Reddersen in view of Fishbine does not overcome the deficiencies of Reddersen in view of Fishbine given the apparent mischaracterization of the subject matter as claimed by the Applicants within independent claim 8 as shown in the Office Action (paper no. 14). Therefore, the Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections. Moreover, claim 12, being a further limitation upon an independent, allowable base claim 8, is also allowable. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection as well.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 10 as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine as applied to claim 8, and further in view of Shreesha.

The combination of Shreesha with Reddersen in view of Fishbine does not overcome the deficiencies of Reddersen in view of Fishbine given the apparent mischaracterization of the subject matter as claimed by the Applicants within independent claim 8 as shown in the Office Action (paper no. 14). Therefore, the Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections. Moreover, claim 10, being a further limitation upon an independent, allowable base claim 8, is also allowable. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection as well.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 11 as being unpatentable over Reddersen in view of Fishbine, Shreesha, and Park as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Grodevant.

The combination of Grodevant with Reddersen in view of Fishbine, Shreesha, and Park does not overcome the deficiencies of Reddersen in view of Fishbine given the apparent mis-characterization of the subject matter as claimed by the Applicants within independent claim 8 as shown in the Office Action (paper no. 14). Therefore, the Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections. Moreover, claim 11, being a further limitation upon an independent, allowable base claim 8, is also allowable. Therefore Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection as well.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, and for various other reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now present are allowable, and withdrawal of the rejections and a Notice of Allowance are courteously solicited. If any impediment to the allowance of the claims remains after entry of this Amendment, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: July 13, 2000

By: Shayne X. Short, Ph.D.

Reg. No.: 45,105

AGENT FOR THE APPLICANTS

Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P.
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1900
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel: (512) 499-6200
Fax: (512) 499-6290